

12/1



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/966,264	09/28/2001	Elizabeth K. Barber	896034605001	4008

7590 12/01/2005
Barbara E. Arndt, Ph. D.
Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue
North Point
901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114

EXAMINER

KAUSHAL, SUMESH

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1633

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/966,264

Applicant(s)

BARBER, ELIZABETH K.

Examiner

Sumesh Kaushal Ph.D.

Art Unit

1633

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5,8-14,16-18,22,23,37 and 41-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5,8-14,16,17,22,23 and 41-44 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3,18 and 37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. .
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. <u> </u> |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u> </u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <u> </u> |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's response filed on 9/12/05 has been acknowledged.

Claims 1-3, 5, 8-14, 16-18, 22-23, 37 and, 41-44 are pending and are examined in this office action.

Applicants are required to follow Amendment Practice under revised 37 CFR §1.121. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/12/05 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 USC 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 18 as written, do not sufficiently distinguish a cell as it exist naturally because the claims do not particularly point out any non-naturally occurring differences

between the claimed products and the naturally occurring products. In the absence of the hand of man, the naturally occurring products are considered non-statutory subject matter. See *Diamond v. Chakrabarty*, 447 U.S. 303, 206 USPQ 193 (1980). The claims should be amended to indicate the hand of the inventor, e.g., by insertion of "An isolated " before cell. See MPEP 2105.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

TAs MPEP 2163.06 notes "If new matter is added to the claims, the examiner should reject the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph - written description requirement. In re Rasmussen, 650 F.2d 1212, 211 USPQ 323 (CCPA 1981)."

Claim 3 as amended encompasses apparently new matter. The applicant asserts that the paragraphs 0052, 0053 and 0442 of published specification disclose "a polynucleotide codes for a protein or polypeptide that binds to a polynucleotide having the sequence of SEQ ID NO:2". However, a careful review by the examiner of the specification failed to identify any support for this new limitation. (*i.e. a part of SEQ ID NO:2 encodes a protein that binds to SEQ ID NO:2*) Since no basis has been found to support the new claim limitation in the specification, the claims are rejected as incorporating new matter.

Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention.

Nature Of Invention

The instant invention relates to a pharmaceutical composition for gene therapy

Breadth Of Claims And Guidance Provided in the Specification

The scope of instant claim encompasses a pharmaceutical composition comprising a nucleotide sequences (claim 1) for the treatment of muscular dystrophy or leukemia.

State Of Art And Predictability

The word "Pharmaceutical" means the administration of a medicinal drug of therapeutic value, which has a characteristic interaction in a body, in terms of its absorption, distribution, metabolism and excretion (see Pharmaceutical and related terms in Merriam Webster's Dictionary). At issue, under the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph is whether, given the Wands-factors, the experimentation was undue or unreasonable under the circumstances. "Experimentation must not require ingenuity beyond that to be expected of one of ordinary skill in the art." See *Fields v. Conover*, 443 F.2d 1386, 170 USPQ 276 (CCPA 1970). Regarding the pharmaceutical use of nucleic acid sequences the state of art at the time of filing clearly teaches that the gene therapy is considered highly experimental area of research at this time, and both researchers and the public agree that demonstrable progress to date has fallen short of initial expectations (*Rosenberg et al*, *Science* 287:1751, 2000, ref of record). It has been difficult to predict the efficiency and outcome of transduced genes because various factors govern the expression and/or therapeutic potential of transduced genes in vivo. The transduction of target cells represents the first critical step in gene therapy, which not only depends upon the type of target cells but also on the choice and/or characteristics of delivery vectors. In addition, besides the limitations in gene transfer the problem to selectively target cells in vivo is still one of the most difficult obstacles to overcome. The viral particles binds to

Art Unit: 1633

many cells they encounter in vivo and therefor would be diluted out before reaching their targets. Most studies have neglected to include well-defined biochemical or clinical end points that would clearly indicate whether the therapy is having a desired effect. Furthermore, Recombinant DNA Advisory committee (RAC) also emphasized that expectations of current gene therapy protocols have been over sold without any apparent success. The advisory panel further emphasized the need for a greater understanding of an underlying mechanism that contribute to a genetic disease along with the pathogenesis of the disease.

In instant case the specification teaches that CD33 is a cell surface marker used to differentiate between acute lymphocytic and acute myelocytic leukemias. On the other hand the specification teaches that the regulation of CD33 including those elements to which it binds in vivo, is not fully understood and there is a need for investigation of this biological system (spec. page 1, lines 17-20). The specification teaches that apo-dystrophin-4 is a putative low-affinity ligand for CD33. The specification asserts that given the association of CD33 with leukemia, the invention provides a means to inactivate expression of a gene correlated with a disease phenotype (spec page 23, lines 1-6). However considering the unpredictability found in the treatment of leukemia the specification fails to disclose a single working example which establishes that the administration of a polynucleotide sequence comprising the polynucleotide sequences of SEQ ID NO:2 (710-966), would lead to the treatment of acute myelocytic leukemia. For example the specification even fails to disclose that low-affinity binding of apo-dystrophin-4 to CD33 is capable of modulating CD33 mediated signal transduction in the proliferation myeloid leukemic cells (see Taylor et al. J Biol Chem, 274(17):11505-11512, 1999). Similarly the specification fail to provide any evidence that SEQ ID NO:2 (710-966), would lead to the treatment of any kind of muscular dystrophy explicitly or implicitly as putatively claimed herein. It is noted that patent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable (See *Brenner v. Manson*, 383 U.S. 519, 536, 148 USPQ 689, 696 (1966), Stating, in context of the utility requirement, that "a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for the search, but

compensation for its successful conclusion.") Tossing out the mere germ of an idea does not constitute enabling disclosure. While every aspect of a generic claim certainly need not have been carried out by an inventor, or exemplified in the specification, reasonable detail must be provided in order to enable members of the public to understand and carry out the invention.

In instant case a gene-based pharmaceutical composition for the treatment of muscular dystrophy and/or leukemia is not routine in the art and without sufficient disclosure regarding the therapeutic effects of any such composition, the experimentation left to those skilled in the art is unnecessarily, and improperly, extensive and undue. See In re Wands 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir, 1988). It is noted that the unpredictability of a particular area may alone provide reasonable doubt as to the accuracy of the broad statement made in support of enablement of claims. See Ex parte Singh, 17 USPQ2d 1714 (BPAI 1991). Therefore considering the state of the art and limited amount of guidance provided in the instant specification, one skill in the art would have to engage in excessive and undue amount of experimentation to exercise the invention as claimed.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "the DNA sequence of SEQ ID NO:1" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Conclusion


Claims 2-3, 18 and 37 are rejected.

Claims 1, 5, 8, 9-14, 16-17, 22-23 and 41-44 are allowable. The instant claims are free of prior art of record because the prior art does not teach or suggest the polynucleotide sequences of SEQ ID NO:2.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sumesh Kaushal Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-0769. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri. from 9AM-5PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-0731.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to **571-272-0547**. For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**


**SUMESH KAUSHAL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1633**